

Mr. SPEAKER.—Does the Hon'ble Minister question the ruling?

Sri R. M. PATIL.—Never perhaps he has misunderstood me.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—The Hon'ble Minister is saying that it is not a matter of public importance.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I don't allow him to say it and I don't allow him to raise it. I don't allow any question contrary to my ruling.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—But the Hon'ble Minister said that it was not a matter of public importance.

Mr. SPEAKER.—He has not said it.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—I request the Hon'ble Speaker to verify if he has said that it is not a matter of public importance and if so, those words must be expunged.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will look into it.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA (Sira).—Whenever such doubts have arisen the Speaker used to refer to the proceedings to find out whether the Member concerned has said or not.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will look into it. There is ample time for me to deal with it.

Have you finished the statement?

Sri R. M. PATIL.—Yes.

Sri K. LAKKAPPA (Hebbur).—I would like to request the Hon'ble Speaker to direct the Hon'ble Minister for Health to give a statement with respect to the incident as to how the poison found its place in liquor. There is mystery in respect of that.

Mr. SPEAKER.—If you are not following any rules, it will have little value. It does not deserve the attention that it deserves. I cannot direct anybody to make a statement.

Sri B. NANJAPPA (Cubbonpet).—Regarding sales tax on poor-man's cycle, I request the Select Committee not to introduce any sales tax on cycle parts. Regarding sales tax on oils, *i.e.*, Pacauv and Dalda, I would like to submit that these oils are used by the common man, *i.e.*, the poorer class of people and that the clause pertaining to the sales tax on these oils be deleted from the Bill. In these hard

days, the poorer class or the middle-class people cannot afford to use ghee or butter. These are my few remarks.

Mysore Sales Tax (Second Amendment) Bill, 1962 as reported by the Select Committee.

Motion to consider

(Debate Contd.)

ಶ್ರೀ ವಿ. ಎಂ. ದೇವ್ (ಗುಬ್ಬಿ).—ನಾನು ಹೇಳ ಬೇಕೆಂದಿರುವುದಿಷ್ಟು: ಈಗ ಬರ ಬರುತ್ತಾ ವರ್ಷ ವರ್ಷ ನಮ್ಮ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಆಹಾರ ಬೆಳೆಯುವುದು ಕಡಮೆ ಯಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ತಕ್ಕ ಹಾಗೆ ಕೆರೆಗಳೂ ಒಡೆದು ಒಟ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾರಾಂಶವಾಗುವ ಭೂಮಿ ಸಹ ಕಡಮೆ ಯಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಇದರಿಂದಾಗಿ ಹಳ್ಳಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾರೇ ವಿದ್ಯಾವಂತರೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಕಾಲ ಇರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯ ವಿಲ್ಲ. ನೀರಾವರಿ ಬೇಸಾಯ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಅನುಕೂಲತೆಗಳಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ತಿಳಿದು ಜನರು ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಈ ಕಡೆ ಬರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪುರು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇಂಥ ಸಂದರ್ಭವಿರುವಲ್ಲಿ ತಾವು ಆಹಾರ ಧಾನ್ಯಗಳ ಮೇಲೆ ಸೂಪರ್ ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸ್ ಹಾಕಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಇದು ಸರೃಥಾ ನ್ಯಾಯವಲ್ಲ. ಅದರಿಂದ ತಾವು ಈ ತೆರಿಗೆ ಹಾಕುವ ಮುನ್ನ ಒಂದು ಆಶ್ವಾಸನ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಏನೆಂದರೆ oil cake ಆಚೆಗೆ ಹೋಗುವುದನ್ನು ನಿಲ್ಲಿಸಬೇಕು. ಎರಡನೆಯದಾಗಿ ಒಡೆದು ಹೋಗಿರುವ ಕೆರೆಗಳನ್ನು ಡಿಪಾರ್ಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಆಗಿ ಅಥವಾ ಪ್ರೀಸ್ ವರ್ಕ್ಸ್ ಮೇಲೆ ಮಾಡಿಸಿಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಇಷ್ಟು ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ತಾವು ಹಾಕಿರುವ ಸೂಪರ್ ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸ್‌ನೇ ಆಲ್ಲ, ಅದರ ಎರಡರಷ್ಟು ಬೇಕಾದರೂ ಹಾಕಿ ಅದನ್ನು ಕೊಡ ತ್ತೇವೆ.

ಇಷ್ಟು ಮಾತ್ರ ಹೇಳಿ ನಾನು ನನ್ನ ಭಾಷಣವನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಚನ್ನಪ್ಪೇಗೌಡ (ಹೊಸಕೋಟೆ).—ಈಗ ಲೈಸೆನ್ಸ್ ಫೀ 1½ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಅಥವಾ 2 ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಇರುವಾಗ ಮ್ಯಾಗ್ನಿಟುಮ್ ಲಿಮಿಟನ್ನು 2 ಸಾವಿರ, 3 ಸಾವಿರ ಎಂದು ನಿಗದಿ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ, ಅಂದಮೇಲೆ ಮುಂದೆ ಲೈಸೆನ್ಸ್ ಫೀಯನ್ನು 5 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳು ಎಂದು ಮಾಡಿದ ಮೇಲೆ ಮ್ಯಾಗ್ನಿಟುಮ್ ಲಿಮಿಟನ್ನು 7-7½ ಸಾವಿರವೆಂದು ನಿಗದಿ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ದಲ್ಲವೇ?

†**Sri D. PARAMESWARAPPA (Honnali).**—Sir, speaking on this Sales Tax (Second Amendment) Bill, I am constrained to say that this Bill is devoid of forethought and premeditation.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That stage is over.

Sri D. PARAMESWARAPPA.—Even at this stage I think I am not precluded from expressing my views because the

(SRI D. PARAMESWARAPPA)

Bill has been referred to the Select Committee and its report is before us for discussion.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The implication of that is that the principle of the Bill is accepted.

Sri D. PARAMESWARAPPA.—True. If I am precluded from expressing my views with regard to the report of the Select Committee, it virtually means that we are going to accept the Bill as reported by the Select Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Kindly bear in mind the difference between the general principles involved in the Bill before it is referred to a Select Committee. The Select Committee stage comes after the basic principles are accepted. Then you have to discuss the report as amended. With regard to that view, I will not say anything. But if you simply say 'I oppose the Bill *de novo*,' it is wrong.

Sri D. PARAMESWARAPPA.—I can oppose the taxation itself.

Sri S. M. KRISHNA.—This House did not have an opportunity to give its opinion or its vote. You were pleased to remark that the House has agreed to the principle of the Bill, and now that principle cannot be questioned, my submission is: We have not had an opportunity to express our considered opinion on the principles of the Bill. We said that the Bill might be referred to the Select Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will ask you to go through the proceedings of the House. The question was put that the Bill be taken into consideration and it was passed. After that reference to the Select Committee was made.

Sri B. HUTCHE GOWDA (Turuverkere).—Select Committee version is also majority opinion. Even then, I have a right to move amendments today.

Sri G. V. GOWDA (Palya).—Several Members might have said in the discussion that they are opposing the principle. The mere fact that it is sent to the Select Committee; does it mean that the House has given verdict so far

as the acceptance of the principles is concerned?

Mr. SPEAKER.—May be, I am wrong. I will consider it.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—The principles have been accepted by this House and it has been referred to the Select Committee. If there are any changes in wording or phraseology, that may be done within the report of Select Committee. We cannot now oppose it.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Can the House say that we will vote down the whole Bill?

Sri B. D. JATTI.—Rule 77 says:

“The debate on a motion that the Bill as reported by the Select or Joint Select Committee be taken into consideration, shall be confined to consideration of the report of the Select or Joint Select Committee and the matters referred to in that report or any alternative suggestions consistent with the principle of the Bill.”

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—If the Select Committee has failed to consider the observations made in this House that the principles cannot be accepted, are we not competent to comment on that?

Mr. SPEAKER.—What are the terms of reference?

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—General observations made when the discussion took place.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I cannot agree with you.

†Sri J. H. SHAMSUDDIN (Deputy Minister for Electricity).—When the Hon'ble Members are opposed to the principles of the Bill and after taking into consideration that opposition, the House voted and said that the Bill be accepted at the first reading and therefore, their opposition to the principles has been negated by the verdict of the House and it cannot be re-agitated again.

Sri S. SHIVAPPA.—When we opposed the Bill, that also was before the Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Rule 74 says:

“When a motion that a Bill be taken into consideration by the

Assembly is passed, the member in charge or any other member may move that the Bill be referred to a Select or Joint Select Committee."

What is the effect of that? It has voted.

†Sri ANNARAO GANAMUKHI (Afzalpur).—There are three readings of a Bill. In the first reading as such, the principles involved in the Bill are discussed in detail and when the principles are accepted, then amendments stage or second reading stage comes. What happens is, no amendment is accepted which is outside the scope of the Bill. The Bill is sent to the Select Committee to consider it in detail and read clause by clause so that if there is any inconsistency which is against the principle, that may be deleted. Therefore, I think, at this stage to argue against the very principles of the Bill will be against the rules of procedure.

▲ Sri G. V. GOWDA.—All the observations made in the House are before the Select Committee and if they fail to take into consideration that aspect, what should be done?

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is not after discussion alone, but it is sent after discussion and putting to vote. I am not changing my view unless you convince me that I am wrong. After the consideration motion was voted upon, motion for reference to Select Committee was made. At that stage they considered all the amendments and sent the Bill to this House. Now you cannot go behind it. You can move amendments but you cannot say that the Bill should be rejected.

2-30 P.M.

Sri D. PARAMESWARAPPA.—My respectful submission is, merely because the Bill is referred to a Select Committee for consideration, it does not mean that the powers of this House are taken away in discussing this Bill at great length that even the principles of the Bill. We are not barred.

Mr. SPEAKER.—You have made yourself clear. But I am not able to accept that. That is my difficulty. If

I had had the least doubt, I would have asked for discussion to be continued. That is what the Hon'ble Finance Minister says and that is what my friend the seasoned parliamentarian Sri Anna Rao says. If you still feel like that, I do not know if you have studied thoroughly.

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—On the Select Committee report itself, the members can ventilate their grievances.

Mr. SPEAKER.—We cannot criticise the principles.

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—Even the Select Committee cannot vary the principle.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is why there is the present motion of the Finance Minister that the report of the Select Committee and the Bill as amended by them be taken into consideration.

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—Perhaps the Hon'ble Members want to throw light on the Select Committee report. That may be their intention, as far as I understand.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—At the consideration stage, this Bill has been referred to the Select Committee. Now the Select Committee has made certain amendment to that report and the report is before the House. While speaking on the Bill as reported by the Select Committee, suppose one speaks about a particular amendment, the principle underlying that amendment can be discussed here. On general principles of the Sales-tax Bill, we have discussed. But the principle underlying the particular amendment, we have to discuss—why such a thing has been made, why such a thing has not been made, etc.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Leader of the Opposition is perfectly right.

Sri D. PARAMESWARAPPA.—If it is the direction of the Chair that I should not refer to the principles involved in this Bill, because it had been referred to the Select Committee and the report of the Select Committee is placed before this House, then I would dilate on certain points, as stated in the report of the Select Committee. Sir, after the Bill was referred to the

(SRI D. PARAMESWARAPPA)

Select Committee, various amendments have been suggested by the Select Committee and those amendments as reported by the Select Committee are now before us for discussion. I have perused the amendments and I would like to make some alternative suggestions to this Bill. In this Bill, the turnover is fixed at Rs. 7,500 for purposes of computing sales-tax. Let us consider this deeply and see whether it affects the greater section of the traders, *i. e.*, the dealers. If we fix this limit of Rs. 7,500 as the basis for assessment, then I submit that it will cause great hardship and much inconvenience to the small traders. You have included in this Act a very sharp weapon that could be used either way by the assessing officers. Every dealer is expected to keep account and if he fails to keep accounts, then the assessing officer can assess on mere imagination. If an assessee fails to render accounts in the stipulated time then the assessing officer can assess to any extent he likes. That is the most saddest picture of this Act.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—Is it a change and if so with reference to what clause? Is it a change in the original section or in the present clause?

Sri D. PARAMESWARAPPA.—I am suggesting a change in the original Act.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—That section in the original Act is under consideration.

Sri D. PARAMESWARAPPA.—I invite your attention to this dangerous aspect of this Act, and it would be better if you make necessary amendments so far as those sections are concerned. I am only drawing your attention to that. I was telling about the harassment that is going to be caused to the petty dealers. In this respect, as you are aware, there are so many cases lying before the Courts, merely because several dealers have not paid sales-tax. Please imagine the profit of a dealer whose turnover is Rs. 7,500 per annum or Rs. 800 per month. The profit on Rs. 800 a month will be a paltry sum. Can you expect such a person to keep

a clerk to keep accounts to furnish to the sales tax authorities? How much inconvenience and harassment it will cause to the poor dealers can well be imagined. So, I request the Finance Minister to make the necessary amendments from this aspect. To-day some small dealers approached me and said that if the turnover is fixed at Rs. 7,500, it will cause great hardship and inconvenience to them and they will be put to expenditure to maintain a clerk to keep accounts. All these they have to meet from the meagre profit that they are making. If that is the case, you can very well imagine how much hardship it will cause to the traders.

Then, Sir, I would like to say that this tax would ultimately affect trade because this tax is ultimately levied on the consumer and the dealer because the dealer would always levy the sales tax from the consumer. Though this is an indirect tax, the incidence of this tax will fall on the consumer because ultimately, he will have to pay this tax from his pocket. In this way, trade will be very much affected.

As regards multi-point tax, this tax will be levied at every stage through which a commodity passes from the production stage to the consumer stage because this is multipoint levy. So it would have been better if this tax is levied at single point and not multipoint. I am opposed to this sales tax because it ultimately affects trade as well as agricultural production for the reasons I have stated. I hope the Finance Minister will consider this aspect and come out with suitable amendments so that our trade may flourish. As many economists have opined, there should be free trade in the country because the prosperity of the country always depends upon the free trade that it is having. If you levy such a tax on the traders, it will be restricting trade and in the result trade and industry will have to suffer by this taxation measure.

Then, Sir, it is seen that we have taxed most of the essential commodities like sugar, bicycle and other commodities mentioned in the Bill. These need some reconsideration because

these are commodities which are very essential to the poor people. So far as refined oil is concerned, one of my friends just now pointed out that this is a common commodity always used by the poorer section because they cannot afford to purchase butter as the rich can do. So in the interest of the poorer section of the people, it is necessary that this tax should be removed from this or if that is not possible, the rate of tax should be reduced. With these words I would again request the Finance Minister to see that this tax on refined oil is deleted.

† ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡ (ತುರುವೇಕೆರೆ).—ಫರ್ಷ ರೈಮ್ಸ್‌ಗೆ 1½% ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸ್ ಹಾಕಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಆಹಾರ ಬೆಳೆಯಬೇಕು, ರೈತರಿಗೆ ಪ್ರೋತ್ಸಾಹ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿರುವಾಗ ನಿನ್ನ ದಿವಸ ಕೊಟ್ಟ ಹಣಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಇವತ್ತು 1½ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದರೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ನಮ್ಮ ದಿ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ? ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಜನರಿಗೆ ಅವರು ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಆಹಾರ ಒದಗಿಸಬೇಕೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ತಾವು ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡ ಬೇಕು. ದಿವಸ ದಿವಸಕ್ಕೆ ಕಂದಾಯದ ಹೊರೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗುತ್ತಾ ಇದೆ. ಆರ್ಥಿಕ ನಟಿವರ ಒಂದೇ ಕಾಗು ವಿನೆಂದರೆ 42 ಕೋಟಿ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ದೊರಕಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿ ಬಿಡೆ ಎಂಬುದು. ಏಕೆ ಬೇಕು? ಬಂದ ದುಡ್ಡು ಏನಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಕೂಡ ನೀವು ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಕಳೆದ 4 ವರ್ಷಗಳ ಫೈನಾನ್ಸ್ ಮಿನಿಸ್ಟರಿಗೆ ಸೇರ್ಪೆ ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸ್ ಒಂದೆ ಬಾಬಿನಲ್ಲಿ ವರ್ಷಕ್ಕೆ ಸುಮಾರು 4 ಕೋಟಿ 90 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಬಂದಿದೆ. 4 ವರ್ಷಕ್ಕೆ 20 ಕೋಟಿ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಆಯಿತು.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—What is the basis for this calculation? If the Hon'ble member feels that year by year I am getting Rs. 4 crores more let him give his basis for his calculation.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡ.—24 ನೆಯ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೋತ್ತರ ಗಳ ಕಟ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರೇ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಅದರಿಂದ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದೇನೆ. ಅದರಂತೆ 4 ವರ್ಷಕ್ಕೆ ಎಷ್ಟಾಯಿತು? ವರ್ಷೇ ವರ್ಷೇ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಮಾಡಿ ಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದು, ಈಗ 42 ಕೋಟಿ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಬೇಕು ಎಂದರೆ ಏಕೆ ಬೇಕು?

ಕೊಡುವ ಹಣ ನ್ಯಾಯವಾದ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಖರ್ಚಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆಯೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಗಮನಿಸಬೇಕು. ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡಿದ ವರ್ಷೇ ವರ್ಷ ಕಂದಾಯ ಹಾಕುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಆರ್ಥಿಕ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಹೇಳುವುದು, ಚಿಕ್ಕ ಉಳಿತಾಯ ಎಂದು ಉಪಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಹೇಳುವುದು; ಈ ಎರಡರಿಂದ ದೇಶ ಎಂದಿಗೂ ಉದ್ಧಾರವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಉದಾಹರಣೆಗೆ ಅಮೆರಿಕಾದ ರಾಯಭಾರಿಗಳಾದ ಗಾರ್ ಬ್ರೇಡ್‌ರವರು ಆರ್ಥಿಕ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಹಿಂದೆ ಬಂದಿದ್ದಾಗಲೂ ಮತ್ತೆ ಮೊನ್ನೆ ದೆಹಲಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಲಹೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈಗ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಅನುಸರಿಸುತ್ತಿರುವ ನೀತಿಯಿಂದ ದೇಶ ಮುಂದುವರಿಯುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ಉದ್ಯೋಗಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಸಾರಿ ಇತೆವೆಸ್

ಮಾಡಬಹುದು. ಅದು ದುಡಿದುಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಮೊನ್ನೆ ತಾನೆ H. M. T. ಗೆ ಹೋಗಿದ್ದೆವು. ಅದರ ಉತ್ಪತ್ತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಕಾರ್ಖಾನೆಯನ್ನು ಪ್ರಾರಂಭಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡದಿದ್ದರೆ, ನಮ್ಮನೆ ಕಂದಾಯ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದರೆ ದೇಶ ಉದ್ಧಾರವಾಗುವುದು ಯಾವಾಗ? ಎಷ್ಟು ದಿವಸ ಹೊಟ್ಟೆ ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಕಟ್ಟಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯ? ಮುಂದಿನ ಪೀಳಿಗೆಯವರಿಗೆ ಸುಖವಾಗಬಹುದು. ಈ ದಿವಸ ನಾವು ಉಳಿದು ಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದರೆ ತಾನೆ ಮುಂದಿನವರಿಗೆ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುವುದು. ಈ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಕೂಡ ನೋಡಬೇಕು. ಈಗ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿರುವುದು ಹೋಯಿತ್ತೇ ದೆವ್ವ ಅಂದರೆ ಗವಾಕ್ಷಲೆ ಬಂತು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವಂತಿದೆ. ಯಾರಲ್ಲಿ ದುಡಿಮೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿದೆ, ಎಲ್ಲ ಉತ್ಪತ್ತಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿದೆ ನೋಡಿ ಅಲ್ಲ ಕಂದಾಯ ಹಾಕಬೇಕಾದ್ದೂ ನ್ಯಾಯ. ಅದನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಬೈಸಿಕರ್ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವವರು, ಕಂತಿನ ಹಣ ಕಟ್ಟಿ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಈ ತೆರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದರೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಕಷ್ಟವಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಇಂಥ ನಣ್ಣು ಪುಟ್ಟ ವಿಷಯಗಳ ಕಡೆ ನೋಡುತ್ತೀರೇ ಎನಾ ಲಕ್ಷಾಂತರ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳು ಕೊಳೆಯುತ್ತಿರುವ ಕಡೆ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಯ ಕೊಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಕಂದಾಯ ಹಾಕಬಾರದೆಂದು ಯಾರೂ ಹೇಳುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ದೇಶಾಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿಗಾಗಿ ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಮಾರ್ಗ ಅನುಸರಿಸಬಾರದೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಮೊದಲು ಪೋಲಾಗುತ್ತಿರುವುದನ್ನು ತಡೆಗಟ್ಟಿ. ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡದೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಹಣ ಬರಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡರೂ ಪ್ರಯೋಜನವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಜನರಿಗೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಕಷ್ಟವಿದೆ? ಮಳೆ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಆಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಹಾಹಾಕಾರವಿದ್ದಿದೆ, ಸಾಲದ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರವಾಹ ಬಂದು ಮನೆ ಮಠ ಕೊಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಯಿತು. ಇದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಗಮನಿಸದೆ ಕಂದಾಯ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಸಿದರೆ ದೇಶವನ್ನು ಇವರು ಉಳಿಸುತ್ತಾರೆಯೇ? ಇದರಿಂದ ದಿವಸ ದಿವಸಕ್ಕೆ ಜನರಿಗೆ ಭಾರ ಜಾಸ್ತಿಯಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಈ ಸಂಬಂಧದಲ್ಲಿ ಹಿಂದೆ ಒಂದು ಕಥೆ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದರು. ಹಿಂದೆ ಸುಂಕದ ಮಾರಣ್ಣ ಎಂಬ ಒಬ್ಬ ರಾಜನಿದ್ದ. ಅವನು ಎಲ್ಲಕ್ಕೂ ಸುಂಕ ಹಾಕಿದ್ದ; ಜನರಿಗೆ ಬೇಜಾರಾಯಿತು. ಅವನು ಹೋದರೆ ಸಾಕು ಎಂದಿದ್ದರು. ಸಾಯುವ ಕಾಲ ಬಂತು. ಆಗ ಮಗನನ್ನು ಕರೆಸಿ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಸಂಪಾದಿಸು ಎಂದ. ಮಗ ನೀನು ಸುಖವಾಗಿ ಸಾಯಬಹುದು, ನಾನು ಎಲ್ಲವನ್ನೂ ನೋಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ. ತಂದೆ ಸತ್ತು ಹೋದ. ಒಂದು ವರ್ಷ ಯೋಚಿಸಿ ಅಮೇರಿಕ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕರೆಸಿದ. ನಮ್ಮ ಅಪ್ಪನಿಗಿಂತ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಕಂದಾಯ ಹಾಕಿದರೆ ನನಗೆ ಇನ್ನೂ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಹೆಸರು ಬರುತ್ತದೆ, ಆ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ; ಆದರೆ ಯಾವ ಬಾಬಿನನ್ನೂ ಬಡಬೆ ಹಾಕಲಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಅಮೇರಿಕ ಹಣೆಯ ಮೇಲಿರುವ ನಾಮಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಯಂತೆ ಸುಂಕ ಹಾಕಿದರು. ನಮ್ಮ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ನೈತಿಕ ಮಟ್ಟ ಇಂಥ ಗತಿಗೆ ಇನ್ನು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ದಿನಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಬರುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಯಾವಾಗಲೂ ಒಂದು ರಾಜ್ಯವಾಗಲಿ ಅಥವಾ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿಯಾಗಲಿ ತನ್ನ ನೈತಿಕ ಮಟ್ಟವನ್ನು ಉಳಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗಬೇಕು. ನಾವು ಕಂದಾಯ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದು ಕಾಸನ್ನೂ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡುತ್ತದೆಂಬ ಭರವಸೆ ಜನರಿಗೆ ಬರಬೇಕು. ಅದನ್ನು ಪೋಲು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾ ರೆಂಬ ಭಾವನೆ ಬರಬಾರದು. ನಾವು ಇದನ್ನು ಮೊದಲಿಂದ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಇದುವರೆಗೆ ಕೋಟಿಗಟ್ಟಲೆ ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡಿದರೂ ಹಣದಿಂದ ಪ್ರತಿಫಲವೇನು? 15 ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದ. ಕಂದಾಯಕೊಟ್ಟರೂ ಇನ್ನೂ ಸುಖ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡ)

ದೊರಕಿಲ್ಲ. ನಮ್ಮ ಮಕ್ಕಳು ಓದುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಶಾಲೆ ಕಟ್ಟಿಕೊಂಡಿ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಿದರೆ ಇಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಈಗ ಮುದುಕರು, ಕುಂಟರು, ಕುರುಡರು ಮುಂತಾದವರಿಗೇನಾದರೂ ಸಹಾಯ ಮಾಡಿ ಎಂದರೆ ಗಮನ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಸಮಾಜವಾದಿ ಸಮಾಜ ರಚಿಸಲಿರುವವರು, ಆರ್ಥಿಕ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಈ ದಿವಸ ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾವು ಕಮಿಟ್‌ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಇಂಥ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಜನರ ನಂಬಿಕೆಗೆ ಪಾತ್ರ ವಾಗದಿದ್ದರೆ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಕಂದಾಯ ವಸೂಲಾಗುತ್ತದೆ? ಯಾವ ಧೈರ್ಯದ ಮೇಲೆ ಈ ತೆರಿಗೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಮರ್ಥನೆ ನೀಡಬೇಕೋ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದಾದ ರಿಂದ ಗೊಬ್ಬರ, ಸೈಕರ್ ಮುಂತಾದುವುಗಳಿಗೆ ತೆರಿಗೆ ಹಾಕಿರುವುದು ಅನ್ಯಾಯ, ಇದನ್ನು ಬಂಡಿತ ತೆಗೆಯ ಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಈ ವಿಧೇಯಕವನ್ನು ವಿರೋಧಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

(Sri Anna Rao, was called upon to speak.)

†Sri V.M.DEO.—On a point of order, Sir, Since he was a member of the Select Committee, if at all he disagrees with the report, he should have submitted a dissenting minute.

Mr. SPEAKER. — He cannot run counter to his own report, but he can say something in support of it. You have criticised it so much and he might like to say something on it.

Sri V. M. DEO.—He had the option. Now, the report is there. What else can he have to say?

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—Can he participate in the debate?

Mr. SPEAKER.—He can.

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—Sir, I want one clarification from the Hon'ble Minister. My views are known to you about this fee. The wording in entry 66 of the Constitution is, "fees in respect of any of the matters in this list but not including fees taken in any court."

(Sri V. M. DEO rose.)

Mr. SPEAKER.—Whether the fee, tax or cess is within the ambits all that has been discussed. What were you doing all the while? Should you not have raised it much earlier?

Sri ANNARAO GANAMUKHI.—They have occurred to me on second thoughts.

Sri V. M. DEO.—Sir, the Hon'ble Member said that you know his viewpoint. Being a member of the Select Committee, I appeal to him and I also request you to consider it seriously that he should have taken more interest and submitted his dissenting minute as provided for in the Rules. This is a unanimous report.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am not able to follow the point of orders and I do not think there is any point of order. The Minister will go on.

Sri V. M. DEO.—Sir, I submit that. I was not given a chance to conclude and you gave a ruling without hearing me.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The House will now rise for half an hour recess.

The House adjourned for Recess at Three of the Clock and reassembled at Thirty Minutes Past Three of the Clock.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

Sri B. D. JATTI.—MR. SPEAKER, Sir,

So far, I have heard the observations of the Hon'ble Members regarding the Sales Tax (amendment) Bill. when this Bill was referred to the Select Committee, the Select Committee did consider all the suggestions made in this Hon'ble House. It was also expressed by one of the Hon'ble Members, Sri V.S. Patil that he wants to give some credit to the Select Committee, because most of the views, which were expressed, have been considered by the Select Committee and have been accepted. So, I take it that there is general approval for the report of the Select Committee. However, some of the Hon'ble Members have made references to two or three articles and about which I want to explain.

Sir, the important commodity is food-grains and also raw silk. The Committee are of the opinion that it is not desirable to take away the exemption

now granted in respect of sales of raw silk and foodgrains. The exemption that was provided for in the original Act has been retained, and they have not changed it. The Committee also thought it very seriously and it was not in favour of levying either tax on single-point or multi-point, because there will be some difficulty in collecting this tax from the people in general. So, they wanted to avoid it. Again Sir, the Select Committee was also in favour of increasing the licence fee, because licence fee is not a new thing. It finds place in the original Act. As such, there is no question of change of any principle. That principle was accepted and according to that principle licence fee is collected since 1957 and it has worked well and it has stood the test of the time. So, they thought that instead of Rs. 1-50 it should be raised to Rs. 5/-. I want to explain how it is not going to affect much the Commission Agents. There are number of representations from the Commission Agents or Dalalies or Adathi or Brokers. What they argue is that it is they who ought to pay from their own pocket, they will be suffering very heavily and so it is not correct to increase the licence fee, and suggest that we may adopt single-point tax. The view of the members of this side and the view of the members of the Select Committee is that if we accept even one percent single-point, it will affect the mass in general, I will explain how the Commission Agents are not going to suffer heavily. Perhaps all the Hon'ble Members know that most of the trade regarding foodgrains is in the Regulated Markets. So, what exactly is the commission which has to be taken or charged by the Commission Agents is also regulated and nobody can do against the instructions of the Regulated Markets. In Belagum Division, the Regulated Market Committees allow the Commission Agent to charge 78 nP. per Rs. 100/- of sale produce recoverable from both the buyers and sellers. That means Rs. 1-50 nP. plus 6 nP., i.e., Rs. 15-60 nP., they are getting. They are allowed to charge both seller and buyer. That means they are getting Rs. 15-60 nP. per

Rs. 1,000/- of foodgrains. Now we are asking the Commission Agents to pay Rs. 5/- out of Rs. 15-60 nP. Still they have Rs. 10/-.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಚನ್ನಬೈರೇಗೌಡ.—ಮೊದಲು maximum limit 2 ಸಾವಿರಕ್ಕೆ ನಿಗದಿಮಾಡಿದ್ದರಿಗೆ; ಈಗ 5 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗೆ Licence fee ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಸಿರುವುದರಿಂದ maximum ನ್ನೂ double ಮಾಡಬಹುದು.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—Regarding the upper limit the Hon'ble Member is suggesting. I will come to that point after some time. What I am suggesting just now is that in Belgaum Division, the commission charges which are allowed to be charged by the Commission Agents, as I just now said, are 78 nP., per Rs. 100/- of sales produce recoverable from both the buyers and sellers; that means, if a person sells Jawar or Wheat costing Rs. 1,000/-, then the Commission Agent will get Rs. 15/- plus 60 nP., for Rs. 1,900/- worth of grain. Out of that, Government will ask the Commission Agent to pay Rs. 5/-. Still he will have Rs. 10-60 nP. In Mysore and Bangalore Division the commission charges range from Rs. 1-56 nP., to Rs. 2/- per hundred rupees of sale proceeds, recoverable only from sellers. There is some discretion given to the Commission Agents. They can begin from Rs. 1-56 nP. to Rs. 2/-. Even if I calculate at the rate of Rs. 1-56 nP., again for Rupees 1,000/- they will get Rs. 15/- plus 60 nP. If they charge at Rs. 2/- per hundred, they will get Rs. 20/-. If they get Rs. 15-60 nP., after deducting Rs. 5/- licence fee, they will have Rs. 10-60 nP., and if they collect Rs. 20/- they will have Rs. 15/-. So, they are not going to be hard hit. In Gulbarga Division, the commission charges are ranging from Rs. 1-52 nP., to Rs. 2/- per hundred rupees of sale recoverable from sale proceeds. It is just like Mysore and Bangalore Divisions. Therefore, in any case, the Commission Agents are not going to be hit hard. They will have still some money. That is why the Select Committee thought of increasing the commission charges rather than agreeing to one percent single-point tax or one percent multi-point tax.

Another point which has been raised by the Hon'ble Member Sri Channabyre

(SRI B. D. JATTI)

Gowda is that there was some upper limit of 2,000. Now, there is no limit. That means persons who are dealing in foodgrains will have to pay more than Rs. 2,000. That is what it means. The intention of this House all along is that persons who earns more profit should pay more. It is in consonance with that principle that I have removed the upper limit. Again, there is no suggestion from any quarter so far as the upper limit is concerned, that it should be fixed at such and such a level. That is why it has not been possible for me to consider that suggestion.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಚನ್ನಬೈರೇಗೌಡ.—ತಾವು Upper limit ನ್ನು ನಿಗದಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ ವ್ಯಾಪಾರಸ್ಥರಿಗೆ ಬಹಳ ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—That is true. The point is somebody should suggest it. If I am allowed to suggest by the Chair I am prepared to do it. I will seek the permission of the Chair. We have now raised Rs. 1.50 licence fee to Rs. 5. My intention is to increase the limit of Rs. 2,000 to Rs. 8,000. A number of merchants came to me and represented, even if it is raised to Rs. 10,000 they had no objection, and let there be an upper limit. Those persons who have got big turnovers will be dealing in lakhs. So, it will be very difficult to pay from their own pockets. That is why I want to suggest that I will move an amendment and it may be accepted.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ.ಚನ್ನಬೈರೇಗೌಡ.—5,000 ಇರುವುದನ್ನು 6,000 ಮಾಡಿ.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—All the grain merchants are willing to fix up a limit up to Rs. 10,000, but I am fixing it at Rs. 8,000/-. Then, Sir, reference was made to serial No. 4, bicycles. Originally, the sales tax was 4 per cent. Again in the amending Bill, it was raised from 4 to 6 per cent. Now, the Select Committee has considered it and it has said it may be 5 per cent. Suppose I want to purchase a bicycle, I will pay Rs. 1-50 more, nothing more than that. It is a small change. I hope the House will accept it. Another point which has been referred to by some of the Hon'ble Members is serial No. 25, thrown silk. Originally the tax was

$\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. It was proposed in the amending Bill to raise it to 2 per cent. Now, we have kept it at 2 per cent. There are certain suggestions from some of the Hon'ble Members that if the merchants from outside Mysore State come here purchase thrown silk and prepare finished articles and compete with our merchants; and if a merchant from Mysore State purchases thrown silk pays tax and prepares finished articles, the difference between the rate of the two merchants will be one per cent. By that, it is likely that trade will be diverted from Mysore State to outside. I felt that they are correct. So, I have calculated all the aspects now and I have come to the conclusion that if the difference is only $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent, then there will not be any diversion of trade; in view of transportation charges and other things, nobody will think of purchasing thrown silk and compete with our merchants. So, if the Hon'ble Members agree, there is an amendment tabled also, we will reduce from 2 per cent to $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—With a view to encourage more consumption of thrown silk in the State of Mysore, it is better to have it at 1 per cent.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—We are a producing State; 80 per cent of the silk is produced in our State. The only intention of the Government is to get more money. At the same time trade should not be diverted and so we will reduce it to $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. I hope Hon'ble Members will agree.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎನ್. ಹುಚ್ಚಮಾಸ್ತಿ ಗೌಡ (ಚಂದ್ರಶೇಖರ ಪುರ).—ಮದ್ರಾಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗ 2% ಹಾಕಿಲ್ಲವೇ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚ ಗೌಡ.—ಈಗಲೂ ನಮ್ಮ ಸಿಂಕ್ ಫ್ಯಾಕ್ಟರಿ ನಷ್ಟದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲವೇ?

Sri B. D. JATTI.—Sri Hutchmasti Gowda suggested that in Madras it is 2 per cent, but still I requested him that it may be reduced from 2 to $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. He has agreed to it.

Sri B. HUTCHE GOWDA.—It suits you.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—What should I do? Unless it suits me, I cannot reduce it. One of the Hon'ble Members referred to Chemical Fertilisers. Originally it was 1 per cent; in the

amending Bill it was proposed to increase it to 3 per cent. After full discussion in the Select Committee, we have agreed to 1½ per cent. So, it was only half per cent increase from the original Act. Sir, regarding chillies, it was 2 per cent. The entry is deleted in the proposed Bill, but the entry is deleted and taken to second schedule as Serial No. 81 and there is no controversy about it. There are one or two points; I want to clarify about dealers. Hon'ble Member Sri Venkatai Gowda made a reference to it. In the Act, it is defined to include a Commission Agent who buys or sells. So, a Commission agent who sells foodgrains is also a dealer and has to pay licence fee. It is very clear. The point is there are certain brokers and there are certain commission agents who neither buy nor sell. They will adjust the agreement between two persons but they are not actually in possession of foodgrains. Such a person need not pay anything. It is clear that there are some commission agents who want to remain as commission agents but want to be dealers. Such people will have to pay. Primary producers of raw silk are also dealers and they have to pay licence fee if they sell the same if and turnover exceeds Rs. 7,500 per annum. It is only cocoon rearers that are exempted from tax under the fifth schedule. That is the difference.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—Grower of foodgrains is not classified as a dealer. That the Government concedes. Why should you consider the grower of raw silk as dealer because he is also agriculturist who in his leisure manufactures raw silk in the country charka. Why do you consider him as a dealer?

Sri B. D. JATTI.—Because he sells, he is to be declared as a dealer.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—Does not the grower of foodgrains sell in the open market? He is exempted. He also sells foodgrains.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—That is a different commodity altogether. There cannot be any analogy between foodgrains and raw silk.

I will read from the Supreme Court Judgment of 15th July 1962, page 583, Vol. 13, para 14 :

“Everyone of the considerations that weighed with the Supreme Court is present in the present case.....

The learned Government Pleader states that it works out at the rate of half percent.....

In these circumstances, the one and the only conclusion possible is that the fee levied on the petitioners under the Mysore Sales Tax Law was taxed under sub-section (2) of Section 8.”

I want to read.....

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—I would now suggest to the Government instead of saying licence fee, say licence tax.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—The suggestion made by the Hon'ble Member tallies with the decision of the Supreme Court. I have tried to explain the points on which some observations have been made, and I hope the House will approve the present Report.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಹುಚ್ಚಮಾಸ್ತಿ ಗೌಡ.—ಒಂದು ಕ್ಕಾರಿ ಫಿಕ್ಸ್ಡ್ foodgrains deal ಮಾಡುವವರ ಮೇಲೆ ಲೈಸೆನ್ಸ್ ಫೀ ನೂರು ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ವ್ಯಾಪಾರಕ್ಕೆ 1½ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಇದ್ದುದನ್ನು ಈಗ ಐದು ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಏರಿಸಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಈ ದಡನ್ನು ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸ್ ಎಂದು ಪರಿಗಣಿಸಿ ವ್ಯಾಪಾರ ಮಾಡುವವರ ಮೇಲೆ ಆದನ್ವಯ ಹೇಗೆ ವಸೂಲಿ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟ ಪಡಿಸಬೇಕು. ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ರಾ-ಸಿಕ್ಸ್ ಮೇಲೆ ಅಪ್ರಾಂ ಬಿ ಎ ಬಿಟ್ಟು ವಿಧಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೂ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಲೈಸೆನ್ಸ್ ಫೀಯನ್ನು ಗೊತ್ತು ಮಾಡಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಅವರಿಗೂ ಕೂಡ ಈ ತೆರಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಬಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಸಲಹೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—Now, one suggestion has been made by Hon'ble Sri Hutchmashthy Gowda. I have agreed to raise the upper limit in the case of foodgrains to Rs. 8,000. As far as raw silk is concerned, it is suggested that the upper limit should be raised as in the case of foodgrains. With the permission of the Chair if I am allowed to move that amendment, the licence fee has been raised from Rs. 1.50 to Rs. 2, the maximum may also be raised from Rs. 2,000 to Rs. 2,500. I will move the two amendments, one raising the upper limit of foodgrains and another of raw silk. Hon'ble Member also

(SRI B. D. JATTI)

wanted clarification regarding commission agents dealing in foodgrains, whether they should pay the licence fee. Under the present arrangement, it is the commission agent who has to pay.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಹುಚ್ಚಮಾಸ್ತಿಗೌಡ.—ಕಾಗ ಕಮಿಷನ್ ಏಜೆಂಟ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೀರಿ. ಇನ್ನು ಮುಂದೆ 1½ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಿರುವುದನ್ನು 5 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಲೈಸೆನ್ಸ್ ಫೀ ಏರಿಸಿದಾಗ ಆ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಹೇಗೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ? ಅವನೇ ನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ಇಷ್ಟೇ ಲೈಸೆನ್ಸ್ ಫೀ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ಪ್ರಾವಿಷನ್‌ನ್ನು ಸೇರಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವೇ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಕೂಡಲೇ ಆಲೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು.

SRI B. D. JATTI.—As I just now explained, the Commission agent has to pay only Rs. 5 as licence fees. If he finds out some method of collecting this licence fee from the persons who bring him the foodgrains, it is very difficult for the Government to do anything.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಚನ್ನಬೈರೇಗೌಡ.—ಗೋಲ್ಡ್ ಮತ್ತು ಚಿಲ್ಲೆಸ್ ಎಷಯ ಏನೂ ಹೇಳಲ್ಲ. ಅಂಥ ಮತ್ತು ಮದ್ರಾಸ್ ಪ್ರಾಂತಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಆ ಪದಾರ್ಥಗಳ ಮೇಲೆ ತೆರಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ರಿವೈಜ್ ಮಾಡಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ವೇರಿ ಅಗುತ್ತದಲ್ಲವೇ? ಆದರೆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕು.

MR. SPEAKER.—There is some amendment before the House. When the amendment comes, I will consider that.

I think there has been enough of clarification. Has Sri Venkatai Gowda been satisfied?

SRI G. V. GOWDA.—If the consideration motion is adopted by the House, it means that the House is committed to the principle. But it is not applicable to individual members. They are entitled to offer remarks even opposing the principles.

MR. SPEAKER.—Then what? Finally accept it!

SRI G. V. GOWDA.—But individual members are entitled to oppose the principles.

MR. SPEAKER.—Which principles?

SRI G. V. GOWDA.—Principles of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER.—I want to make it clear. Hereafter, there should be no confusion. Every text book I have seen lays it down like that. Whatever the effect on individual members is after passing

the consideration motion, the House is committed to the principle of the Bill. An identical point was raised in the Parliament. I will read from Vol. 16 (24th Sept. to 16 Oct.) of Parliamentary Debates dated 1st October 1951. The Hon'ble Member, whose name I am not mentioning, said:

"On a point of information, and guidance, can we not even now ask the House to reject the Bill, by showing the absurdity of the Bill? So far as the report of the Select Committee is concerned, can we not prove to the House that its report is absurd and that the House would be well advised in rejecting it. If I remember aright, even at the third reading stage of the Bill, we can ask the House to reject the Bill outright, because, it violates certain principles."

That was the contention of the Hon'ble Member, just as now some Hon'ble Members are contending.

"MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I do not want to curtail discussion."

As I did not do.

"But I can be guided only by the rules. The relevant rules in this connection are Rules 81 and 95. Rule 81..."

As we have got Rule 77 here.

"... relates to the scope of debate on Report of Select Committee and read s:

"The debate on a motion that the Bill as reported by the Select Committee be taken into consideration shall be confined to consideration of the Report of the Select Committee and the matters referred to in that report or any alternative suggestions consistent with the principle of the Bill."

If it is a question of entire negation, it may not be done. Otherwise, there is no point in voting. Soon after the debate was over, the motion was put to the House that this Bill be taken into consideration. It was passed. After that, the position was to take up the Bill clause by clause. At that time, the motion for referring to a Select Committee was put. That was put and passed. The opinion of the House was expressed twice. To say that everything is open for discussion is not

correct. That is what May's Parliamentary Procedure shows.

SRI G. V. GOWDA.—Individual members...

MR. SPEAKER.—What do you mean by individual members? If the House cannot discuss, what about individual members? At the third stage, you cannot vote down the whole Bill. But at this stage, Rule 77 governs it.

The question is:

"That the Mysore Sales-tax (Second Amendment) Bill, 1962, as reported by the Select Committee, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

MR. SPEAKER.—Now we will take up clause by clause. You will have the amended Bill and not the original Bill.

For Clauses 2 and 3, there are no amendments. When I refer to any clause, it means, one as amended by the Select Committee.

The question is:

"That Clauses 2 and 3 of the Bill start part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 2 and 3 were added to the Bill.

4-00 P.M.

SRI A. P. APPANNA (Virajpet).—Sir, beg to move:

"That for sub-clause (1) the following sub-clause shall be substituted, namely,—

(1) in sub-section (1).—

"(a) In the proviso, after the word "Provided," the word "further" shall be inserted, and the words "or to articles of gold or silver" shall be omitted; and

"(b) before the proviso as amended by sub-clause (a), the following provisos shall be inserted, namely.—

"Provided that if and when to the extent to which such turnover relates to articles made of gold or silver, the tax shall be calculated at the rate of one and a half per cent. of such turnover."

MR. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved.

"That for sub-clause (1) the following such clause shall be substituted, namely.—

"(1) in sub-section (1).—

"(a) in the proviso, after the word "Provided" the word "further" shall be inserted, and the words "or to articles of gold or silver" shall be omitted; and

"(b) before the proviso as amended by sub-clause (a), the following proviso shall be inserted, namely.—

"Provided that if and when to the extent to which such turnover relates to articles made of gold or silver, the tax shall be calculated at the rate of one and a half per cent. of such turnover."

Does the Government accept the amendment?

SRI B. D. JATTI.—I accept the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER.—The question is;

"That for sub-clause (1), the following sub-clause shall be substituted, namely.—

"(1) in sub-section (1).—

"(a) in the proviso, after the word "

"Provided" the word "further" shall be inserted, and the words "or to articles of gold or silver" shall be omitted; and

"(b) before the proviso as amended by sub-clause (a), the following proviso shall be inserted, namely.—

"Provided that if and when to the extent to which such turnover relates to articles made of gold or silver, the tax shall be calculated at the rate of one and a half per cent. of such turnover."

The amendment was adopted.

MR. SPEAKER.—The question is

"That clause 4, as amended stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 4, as amended, was added to the Bill.

SRI B. D. JATTI.—I beg to move

"That in sub-clause (2);

"to the new sub-section (3), the following proviso shall be added, namely.—

"Provided that the licence fee shall in no case exceed.—

"(I) two thousand and five hundred rupees in case of

(SRI B. D. JATTI)

dealer liable to pay licence fee under clause (a) ; and

“(II) eight thousand rupees in the case of a dealer liable to pay licence fee under clause (b).”

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved.

“That in sub-clause (2), to the new sub-section (3), the following proviso shall be added, namely.—

“Provided that the licence fee shall in no case exceed.—

“(I) two thousand and five hundred rupees in the case of a dealer liable to pay licence fee under clause (a) ; and

“(II) eight thousand rupees in the case of a dealer liable to pay licence fee under clause (b).”

Sri B. D. JATTI.—I have explained while replying to the objections raised by hon'ble members. We want to fix some upper limit and that is why it has been suggested that in case of raw silk it may be Rs. 2,500 and in the case of foodgrains Rs. 8,500.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಡಿ. ಜತ್ತಿ.—ಅಹಾರ ಧಾನ್ಯಗಳ ವರ್ತಕರಿಂದ ವಸೂಲು ಮಾಡುವ ಲೈಸೆನ್ಸ್ ಶುಲ್ಕದ ಪ್ರಮಾಣದ ಗರಿಷ್ಠಮಿತಿ 8000 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳರ ಜೊತೆಗೆ ಗಣಿತ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದರಿಂದ ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ ತುಂಬಾ ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದರಿಂದ ಅದನ್ನು 5 ಸಾವಿರ ಅಥವಾ 6 ಸಾವಿರಕ್ಕಾದರೂ ಇಳಿಸಿದರೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—It was only at the suggestion of the Hon'ble Member that I agreed to give some relief. Now he argues that this licence fee is more and it should be brought down. It is not correct and I cannot accept his suggestion.

†Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—Sir, I rise to a point of order. Article 297 of the Constitution says ;

“A Bill or amendment making provision for any of the matters specified in sub-clauses (a) to (f) of clause (1) of article 199 shall not be introduced or moved except on the recommendation of the Governor, and a Bill making such

provision shall not be introduced in a Legislative Council.”

Under article 199 whenever the imposition, abolition, remission, alteration or regulation of any tax is proposed, the Governor's recommendation is necessary for it. Clause 5 of the Bill provides that section 6 shall be deleted. It means that particular item has to come under multipoint tax. Under the proviso to sub-section (2) of section 6 of the original Act the licence fee is calculated at 2%, but now it is proposed to enhance it to 5%. So I submit that this amendment requires the sanction of the Governor. If the recommendation of the Governor is not there, then it would be contrary to our rules of procedure also. Rule 80 says ;

“If any member desires to move an amendment which under the Constitution cannot be moved without previous sanction or recommendation, he shall annex to the notice of the proposed amendment a copy of such sanction or recommendation and the notice shall not be valid until this requirement is complied with.”

I do not see the notice to be attached to the amendment, but I think that it would be all right only if the recommendation of the Governor for enhancing the fee is there. Otherwise this amendment would be open to objection.

†Sri G. V. GOWDA.—I oppose the point of order. The Government have already obtained the consent of the Governor to enhance the fee or tax. The original by contemplated levy, was 1% but under the amending Bill it was sought to increase it to 2% and for that purpose the recommendation of the Governor has been obtained. The recommendation of the Governor is there for enhancement, but the quantum of enhancement is not specified and it may be 1%, 2% or even 5%. So the Government are perfectly right in exercising that right.

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—If any increase or alteration in the tax is to be made, then it requires the recommendation of the Governor.

Mr. SPEAKER.—If it is a question of reduction, would you still maintain

that the consent of the Governor is necessary?

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—No. The amending Bill proposes to delete the section altogether. Now, it is proposed to retain not only this section but the original tax. Under Act, it is proposed to be enhanced from 2 to 5 per cent. For that, I hope the recommendation is necessary. It is, however, up to you, Sir, to give your ruling.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—Sir, the point is that, the licence fee has been raised from 1-50 to 5 per cent. Again, the original limit that was there for the turnover has been removed. That means, there would have been enhancement. Now, by accepting this amendment, we are reducing. So, there is no enhancement, but there is reduction. So, it is not necessary to have the sanction of the Governor.

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—Sir, the amending Bill seeks to delete the whole section of the parent Act. Now, it is proposed that, that section is to be retained. Not only is it to be retained but it is also proposed to enhance the licence fee. As the Finance Minister has admitted, an upper limit has to be retained. Therefore, he has raised that limit from Rs. 2,000 to 8,000. Of course, that is a different thing. In the original Act there was one thing and in the amendment proposed to be moved, this tax has been removed. So, I think the recommendation of the Governor is necessary.

‡ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಎ. ಗದಗ್ (ಗದಗ).—ರೈತನನ್ನು ಫೀಜು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು ಬೇರೆ. ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸ್ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು ಬೇರೆ. ರೈತನೇ ಫೀಜು, ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸ್ ಇವೆರಡನ್ನೂ ಒಮ್ಮೊಮ್ಮೆ ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸ್ ಎಂದೋ treat ಮಾಡಬಹುದು ಅದು ಏನೇ ಇರಲಿ. ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸ್ enhance ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆನ್ನುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಪೊಷಿಟಿವ್ ಇತ್ತು. ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸ್ enhance ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂಬುದು ಮಲ್ಟಿ-ಪಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೇ? ಸಿಂಗಲ್ ಪಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೇ? ಯಾವುದು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆನ್ನುವುದು ಬಿಲ್ ನಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿದೆ. ಎಂದು ಮೇಲೆ ಈಗ ಏನು ಪ್ರಶೋನ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀವೆ ಅದು ಯಾವುದೇ ರೀತಿಯಿಂದ ಕಾನೂನಿಗೆ ವಿರುದ್ಧವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಅನಿಸುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸ್ ಆಗಲೇ, ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸ್ ಗೆ ಬದಲಾಗಿ ರೈತನೇ ಫೀ ಆಗಲೇ ಹಾಕಿದರೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಸ್ಟ್ರೆಕಿಡು ಹೇಳಿದ ಆಕ್ಷೇಪಣೆಗೆ ಒಳಪಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Could Sri Anna Rao kindly read Section 6 of the Original Act? That section deals with exemption from the tax in

certain cases and if it is to be deleted, the exempted articles come in for taxation to an unlimited extent.

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER.—If the exemption is taken away, the protection against taxation or licence fee is gone and it gives the right to levy a licence fee or tax to an unlimited extent. For that purpose, the Governor's assent has been obtained.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—The Hon'ble Chair has referred to Clause 5 of the amending Bill. It seeks to delete Section 6 of the principal Act. By that we would have gone to an unlimited extent, but by retaining Section 6 we are only going to a limited extent. That is to say, it is a reduction. Again, in the original Bill it was proposed to collect tax at 1% multi-point and we would have got much more money. Now, we have not accepted it and have accepted only a licence fee of Rs. 5 which works out to ½% multipoint. So, there is definitely a reduction and we are going to get less money. So, it is not necessary to get the approval of the Governor.

Sri ANNARAO GANAMUKHI.—If that is the position, then I have nothing to say. But as far as I am concerned, I am not convinced by that argument.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I put the amendment to the vote of the House. The question is:

“That in sub-clause (2) to the new sub-section (3), the following proviso shall be added, namely:—

‘Provided that the license fee shall in no case exceed.’

(i) two thousand and five hundred rupees in the case of a dealer liable to pay licence fee under Clause (a); and

(ii) eight thousand rupees in the case of a dealer liable to pay licence fee under Clause (b).”

The amendment was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is;

“That Clause 5 as amended, stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

Clause 5 as amended was added to the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now Clause 6.

The question is ;

“That Clause 6 stand part of the Bill”.

The Motion was adopted.

Clause 6 was added to the Bill.

Sri A. P. APPANNA.—Sir, I beg to move

“That in Clause 7 in item (5) for the words ‘two per cent’ the words ‘one and a half per cent shall be substituted”

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved

“That in Clause 7 in item (5) for the words ‘two per cent’ the words ‘one and a half per cent shall be substituted.”

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—Sir, I beg to move.

“That in Clause 7 in item (5) for the words ‘Two per cent’ the words ‘one per cent’ shall be substituted.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved

“That in Clause 7 in item (5) for the words ‘Two per cent’ the words ‘One per cent’ shall be substituted”.

† Sri A. P. APPANNA.—Sir, in the present Act, the rate is $\frac{2}{3}$ per cent on the thrown silk and in the proposed Bill, it is 2 per cent. The increase is more than 100 per cent. So, I submit that it is better if it is restricted to 100 per cent. Hence, I propose that it may be $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

† Sri G. V. GOWDA.—The reason that has been assigned by my friend does not hold good. He says “because it is more than cent per cent, it has to be cut-down”. On the other hand, the establishment on the Industry has got to be seen. By retaining it at 2 per cent or reducing it to $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent, the matter will not improve for the simple reason that it would affect the Industry, Silk industry, particularly the weaving aspect. As you are aware only 15 per cent of thrown silk is being consumed in the State of Mysore and out of 15 per cent, 10 per cent will be consumed by these factories, which manufacture this thrown silk, and we are levying this 2 per cent tax for the 5 per cent of thrown silk that is being consumed apart from these Factory owners. While 85 per cent of the thrown-silk is sent outside, they are being taxed at one per cent, and only 5 per cent of the silk is consumed by the Factory owners. Is there any justify

cation to levy at the rate of 2 per cent because the ultimate amount will be too small? Therefore, in order to secure uniformity in this behalf, it is desirable to levy at one per cent. So, I request the Hon'ble Minister to reduce from 2 per cent to one per cent. If it is retained, the cost of production outside the State of Mysore would be one per cent less than what it will be in the State of Mysore. Thereby, the Industry would be affected and people will not come forward to consume the thrown-silk inside the State of Mysore and every thrown-silk that is produced is likely to be sent out because of high cost of production. I have given reason for reduction of percentage of tax so far as cotton-silk and yarn are concerned. The same case applies with equal force to thrown-silk also. After all, it affects only to 5 per cent of silk consumed. Therefore, I am appealing to the good conscience of the Finance Minister to agree to levy one per cent instead of $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent or 2 per cent.

*ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಕುಡ್ಲೆಮಾನ್ಸಿಗೌಡ.—ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ವೆಂಕಟೇಗೌಡರು ಹೇಳಿದ ವಾದ ಅಷ್ಟು ಸಮರ್ಪಕ ವಾಗಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂಬುದು ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ. ಮೈಸೂರು ದೇಶದ ಹೊರಗಡೆ ಮಾರುವ ಥ್ರೋನ್ ಸಿಲ್ಕ್ಗೆ ಸೆಂಟ್ರಲ್ ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸ್ ಶೇಕಡ ಒಂದರಷ್ಟಿದೆ. ಇದಲ್ಲದೆ ಮದ್ರಾಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಶೇಕಡ ಎರಡರಷ್ಟು ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗು ತ್ತದೆ. ಮೈಸೂರು ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಥ್ರೋನ್ ಸಿಲ್ಕ್ ಕಾರ್ಖಾನೆ ಎಲ್ಲೂ ಇಲ್ಲ, ಮದ್ರಾಸಿನಲ್ಲಿದೆ, ಇಂದಿಯಾ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಇತರ ಅನೇಕ ರಾಜ್ಯಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಥ್ರೋ ಮಾಡುವ ಫ್ಯಾಕ್ಟರಿ ಇದೆ. ಪಕ್ಕದ ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಶೇಕಡ ಎರಡರಷ್ಟು ತೆರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಸೆಂಟ್ರಲ್ ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸ್ ಶೇಕಡ ಒಂದರ ಜೊತೆಗೆ ಈ ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಶೇಕಡ ಎರಡರಷ್ಟು ಮಾರಾಟ ತೆರಿಗೆ ಬೀಳುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದುದರಿಂದ ಅವರು ಹೇಳುವ ವಾದದಲ್ಲಿ ತಿರುಳಿಲ್ಲ. ಪಕ್ಕದ ರಾಜ್ಯಗಳಿಗಿಂತ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ಅಂದರೆ ಶೇಕಡ 80 ರಷ್ಟು ರೇಷ್ಮೆಯು ಮೈಸೂರು ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಉತ್ಪತ್ತಿಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದುದರಿಂದ ಇಂಥ ರಾಜ್ಯ ದಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ರೇಷ್ಮೆ ಮೇಲೆ ಮಾರಾಟ ತೆರಿಗೆ ಹಾಕಿದ್ದರೆ ನಮಗೆ ಉತ್ಪತ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಲು ಬೇರೆ ಮಾರ್ಗವಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರು ವಾದಮಾಡುವಂತೆ ಮದ್ರಾಸ್ ಉತ್ಪತ್ತಿ ಮಾಡುವ ರೇಷ್ಮೆ ಅಥವಾ ಮೈಸೂರು ದೇಶದಿಂದ ಕರುಹಿನುವ ನರಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಕಡಮೆ ಯಾಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದಾದ ರಿಂದ ಶೇಕಡ ಎರಡನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿತ್ತು. ಆದರೆ ಅಷ್ಟನ್ನವರು ತಂದಿರುವ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ರಾಜಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಉತ್ತಮವಾದುದಾಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಬಹುದೇ ಹೊರತು ವೆಂಕಟೇಗೌಡರು ಹೇಳುವ ವಾದ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

Sri SANJEEVANATH AIKALA.—It was on this point that I did not agree

with the other Members of the Select Committee including the Hon'ble Member, Sri Huchmathy Gowda. Here also I do not agree on that particular item.

Sri A. KRISHNA SETTY.—on a point of order, Sir. ಸೆರೆಕ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿ ವರದಿ ಬಂದಾಗ ಅದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪದಿರುವ ಆ ಸಮಿತಿಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ನೋಟ್ ಆಫ್ ಡಿಸೆಂಟ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೇ ಹೋರಾಟ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರತ್ಯೇಕ ವಾದಿಸುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ.

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—Is it open to a Select Committee Member to say what happened in the Select Committee because one Hon'ble Member is saying about it?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Is the Hon'ble Member Sri Sanjeevanath Aikala a member of the Select Committee?

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Yesterday, was not an expression made on the same point?

Sri ANNA RAO GANAMUKHI.—The expression of a view in the House is a different thing from what happened in the Select Committee. Are we barred from saying anything in the House?

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is considerable substance in what Sri Muckannappa says. Is Sri Muckannappa also a Member of the Committee? I will deal with it. What is the recommendation of the Committee? If you have signed that amendment, how can you support that amendment?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಫ್. ಹುಚ್ಚಮಾಸ್ತಿಗೌಡ.—ಅಪ್ಪಣ್ಣನವರು ಹೇಳುವುದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದು, ವೆಂಕಟೇಗೌಡರ ವಾದ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಅಪ್ಪಣ್ಣ ಮಾತ್ರ ನಾನು ಹೇಳಿದೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is only for the purpose of opposing. I have understood the point.

4-30 P.M.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜಿ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಈಗ ಇದನ್ನು ಎರೋಡ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೋ ಅಥವಾ ಸಮರ್ಥನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೋ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಶೇಕಡ ಎರಡರಿಂದ ಒಂದೂ ವರೆಗೆ ಇಳಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರವಿಲ್ಲವೇ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಫ್. ಹುಚ್ಚಮಾಸ್ತಿಗೌಡ.—ನಾನು ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟ ಪಡಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಸೆರೆಕ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯ ವರದಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಶೇಕಡ 2 ಎಂದಿದೆ; ಅದನ್ನು ಒಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಡಮೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ವೆಂಕಟೇಗೌಡರು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ನಾನು ಎರಡೇ ಇರಬೇಕೆಂದು ವಾದಿಸಿದೆ. ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಅಪ್ಪಣ್ಣನವರು ತಂದಿರುವ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ರಾಜಿ ಮಾನೋ ಭಾವದಿಂದ ಬಂದಿರಬಹುದು, ಅದನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಡಬಹುದೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—Whenever the Government are considering such proposals, they will have to consider

whether trade from Mysore State will be diverted to outside the State. Here, Sir, it was proposed in the Select Committee that the rate should be 2 per cent. If an outsider from Madras area comes over here and purchases thrown silk, then he will be liable to pay Central Sales Tax at the rate of one per cent; our people in our State will have to pay 2 per cent. The difference between the two persons will be one per cent. In order to avoid diversion of trade from Mysore State to Madras or any other State, the Government have thought of accepting the amendment of Mr. Appanna to reduce from 2 per cent by half a per cent. By that what will happen is the merchant dealing in thrown silk in Mysore will pay 1½ per cent whereas the merchant from Madras will pay 1 per cent. The difference is ½ per cent. If the transport charge is taken into consideration, there is no possibility of having any profit. So, there is no fear of diversion of trade from Mysore State to other States. That is why I have agreed to 1½ per cent instead of 2 per cent.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will put Sri Appanna's amendment to vote: The question is:

"That in clause 7 in item (5) for the words 'two per cent' the words 'one and a half per cent' shall be substituted."

The amendment was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Sri Venkatai Gowda's amendment falls to the ground. The question is:

"That clause 7, as amended, stand part of the Bill"

The motion was adopted

Clause 7, as amended, was added to the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That clauses 8 and 9 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted

Clauses 8 and 9 were added to the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clause 10. There is an amendment by Sri. Appanna.

Sri A. P. APPANNA.—I beg to move:

“That in item (ii) in the new serial number 37, for the words ‘Rupees ten’ the words ‘Rupees fifteen per piece’ shall be substituted.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved:

“That in item (ii) in the new serial number 37, for the words ‘Rupees ten’ the words ‘Rupees fifteen per piece’ shall be substituted.”

Sri A. P. APPANNA.—In Serial No. 37 of the clause 10, the Select Committee has said that handloom carpets the cost of which does not exceed Rs. 10 must not be taxed. But I feel that since the cost of the materials for producing carpets have gone high, the price must be increased to Rs. 15, because these carpets are used by common man. Hence I propose this amendment

† ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಎ. ಗೌಡ.—ಹತ್ತು ರೂಪಾಯಿಗೆ ಯಾವ carpet ಕೂಡ ಸಿಕ್ಕುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಒಂದು ವೇಳೆ handloom ಸಲ್ಲ ಮಾಡಿದ ಜಮಖಾನಕ್ಕೆ ರಿಯಾಯಿತಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವಿದ್ದರೂ ಅದಕ್ಕೂ ಕೊಡಬಾರದೆಂಬ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಹೀಗೆ ಹತ್ತು ರೂಪಾಯಿಗೆ ಕಡಮೆಯಿದ್ದರೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಮಾರಾಟ ತೆರಿಗೆ ಇಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹದಿನೈದು ರೂಪಾಯಿಗೆ ಕೂಡ ಸಿಕ್ಕುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇಷ್ಟತ್ತಿದ್ದು ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಎಂದು ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಏನಾದರೂ ರಿಯಾಯಿತಿ ಸಿಕ್ಕುತ್ತದೆಯೋ ಏನೋ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಡಿ. ಜತ್ತಿ.—ಮೊದಲಿದ್ದ ಕಾನೂನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟ ಸಂಶಯವಿತ್ತು. ಹತ್ತು ಹದಿನೈದು ರೂಪಾಯಿಗೂ ರಿಯಾಯಿತಿ ಸಿಕ್ಕುತ್ತಾ ಇರಲಿಲ್ಲ ಅದುದರಿಂದ ಬಡವರಿಗೆ ಜಮಖಾನೆಗಳು ಸಿಕ್ಕುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಈಗ ಬಡವರಿಗೆ ಸಹಾಯ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು 15 ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಎಂದು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದುದರಿಂದ ಇದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

“That in item (ii) in the new serial number 37, for the words ‘Rupees ten’ the words ‘Rupees fifteen per piece’ shall be substituted.”

The amendment was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

“That clause 10, as amended, stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

Clause 10, as amended, was added to the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

“That clause 1, the Title and the Preamble stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

Clause 1, the Title and the Preamble were added to the Bill.

Motion to pass.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—I beg to move:

“That the Mysore Sales Tax (Second Amendment) Bill, 1962, as amended, be passed.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

“That the Mysore Seals Tax (Second Amendment) Bill, 1962, as amended, be passed.”

The motion was adopted.

THE MYSORE MUNICIPAL LAWS (AMENDMENT) BILL 1962

Motion to consider.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY (Minister for Municipal Administration).—I beg to move:

“That the Mysore Municipal Laws (Amendment) Bill, 1962, be taken into consideration.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved:

“That the Mysore Municipal Laws (Amendment) Bill, 1962, be taken into consideration.”

† Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR (Belgaum City).—I rise to a point of order. This matter is *sub-judice* So, I submit that this House cannot take this Bill for consideration. A citizen of Belgaum has gone on a Writ Petition to the Mysore High Court and that Writ Petition has been admitted by the High Court. The number of the Petition is 1079/62.

Sir, in the Statement of Objects and Reasons of this Bill, it is stated:

“In the Belgaum Borough Municipality, the term of office of the Councillors has recently expired, and the President and